```
1
   KAREN P. HEWITT
   United States Attorney
   MELANIE A. ANDREWS
   Special Assistant U.S. Attorney
   Office of the U.S. Attorney
   Federal Office Building
   880 Front Street, Room 6293
4
   San Diego, CA 92101-8893
5
   Telephone: (619) 557-7460
   melanie.andrews@usdoj.gov
6
   Attorneys for Defendant
7
   United States of America
8
9
                        UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
10
                      SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
11
   GRANITE STATE INSURANCE
                                       Case No. 07cv2128 BEN(NLS)
12
   COMPANY,
13
                   Plaintiff,
                                       ANSWER TO COMPLAINT
14
              v.
15
   UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
16
                   Defendant.
17
18
        COMES NOW Defendant, the United States of America, by and
19
   through its attorneys, Karen P. Hewitt, United States Attorney and
20
   Melanie A. Andrews, Special Assistant United States Attorney, and
21
   for its Answer to Plaintiff's Complaint sets forth the following:
22
             Answering Paragraph 1 of the Complaint, Defendant states
        1.
23
   that the allegations concerning jurisdiction contained therein are
24
   legal conclusions solely within the purview of the court and for
25
   its determination, and no answer is therefore required. To the
26
   extent an answer is required, said allegations are denied.
27
   //
28
   //
```

- 2. Answering Paragraph 2 of the complaint, Defendant states that the allegations contained therein are legal conclusions solely within the purview of the court and for its determination, and no answer is therefore required. To the extent an answer is required, said allegations are denied.
- 3. Answering Paragraph 3 of the complaint, Defendant states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations therein contained, and based thereon, denies generally and specifically each, all and every allegation contained therein.
- 4. Answering Paragraph 4 of the complaint, Defendant states that the allegations contained therein are legal conclusions solely within the purview of the court and for its determination, and no answer is therefore required. To the extent an answer is required, said allegations are denied.
- 5. Answering the first sentence of Paragraph 5 of the complaint, the Defendant admits that Marl Lemoge sustained injuries on or about April 17, 2004. Answering the second sentence in Paragraph 5 of the complaint, the Defendant admits that on or about April 13, 2006, Plaintiff submitted an administrative claim to the Department of the Navy. Answering the third sentence of Paragraph 5 of the complaint, Defendant admits the substantial truth of the allegations contained therein. Except as specifically admitted, Defendant denies, generally and specifically, each, all and every remaining allegation in said paragraph.

26 //

27 //

28 //

2 07cv2128

- 6. Answering the first sentence of Paragraph 6 of the complaint, Defendant admits the substantial truth of the allegations contained therein. Answering the second sentence of Paragraph 6 of the complaint, Defendant states that the allegation concerning jurisdiction contained therein are legal conclusions solely within the purview of the court and for its determination, and no answer is therefore required. To the extent an answer is required, said allegations are denied.
- 7. Answering Paragraph 7 of the complaint, Defendant states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations therein contained, and based thereon, denies generally and specifically each, all and every allegation contained therein.
- 8. Answering Paragraph 8 of the complaint, Defendant denies, generally and specifically, each, all and every allegation contained therein.
- 9. Answering Paragraph 9 of the complaint, Defendant denies, generally and specifically, each, all and every allegation contained therein.
- 10. Answering Paragraph 10 of the complaint, Defendant states that the allegations contained therein are legal conclusions solely within the purview of the court and for its determination, and no answer is therefore required. To the extent an answer is required, said allegations are denied.

25 //

26 //

27 //

28 //

20 | / /

07cv2128

11. Answering Paragraph 11 of the complaint, Defendant states that the allegations contained therein are legal conclusions solely within the purview of the court and for its determination, and no answer is therefore required. To the extent an answer is required, said allegations are denied.

Defendant denies all other allegations of Plaintiff's complaint not specifically admitted.

AFFIRMATIVE AND OTHER DEFENSES

- 1. The Court lacks jurisdiction over the subject matter of this action.
- 2. The Complaint fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted to the Plaintiff against the Defendant under the Federal Tort Claims Act (FTCA), 28 U.S.C. §§ 1346(b), 2671-80, as averred in the Complaint or otherwise, for the reason that if said Defendant were a private person, it would not be liable to Plaintiff in accordance with the law of the State of California.
- 3. Plaintiff cannot recover for any injury or injuries caused in whole or in part by and through its' or Mark Lemoge's own carelessness, negligence, or assumption of the risk.
- 4. To the extent the acts or omissions of others were the sole proximate causes of any injury, damage, or loss to the Plaintiff, those acts and omissions have superseded any acts or omissions of Defendant.
- 5. Plaintiff cannot recover damages from Defendant for any injuries that were not proximately caused by a negligent or wrongful act or omission on the part of Defendant or any employee or agent of Defendant.

07cv2128

- 6. There was no negligent act or omission on the part of any federal employee.
- 7. Defendant asserts, as an affirmative defense, California Civil Code, § 1431.2(a), which provides:

In any action for personal injury, property damage, or wrongful death, based upon principles of comparative fault, the liability of each defendant for non-economic damages shall be several only and shall not be joint. Each defendant shall be liable only for the amount of non-economic damages allocated to that defendant in direct proportion to that defendant's percentage of fault, and a separate judgment shall be rendered against that defendant for that amount.

- 8. To the extent Plaintiff failed to exercise reasonable care in mitigating its' or Mark Lemoge's damages, its' or Mark Lemoge's claims must be barred or diminished.
- 9. Plaintiff's recovery, if any, is limited to the amount of the claim the Plaintiff presented administratively. See 28 U.S.C. § 2675(b).
 - 10. To the extent Plaintiff has alleged speculative future damages, they do not constitute compensable damages.
- 11. All future damages, if any, must be reduced to present value.
- 12. Income taxes must be deducted from Plaintiff's alleged past and future lost earnings, if any.
- 13. In the event Defendant is found liable, which Defendant expressly denies, Defendant is entitled to an offset against damages, if any, for all amounts received by Plaintiff from the United States of America and its agencies, by reason of Plaintiff's alleged injuries.

27 //

28 //

5 07cv2128

07cv2128

6